

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/616,623 Examiner Phallaka Kik	LU ET AL. Art Unit 2825

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** non-final rejection

(1) Phallaka Kik.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) David D. Brush (Reg. No. 34,557).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 26 January 2006

**Time:** 4:55PM

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

1-3,5-9-17,20

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to the Examiner's indication that claims 2,6,7,16,20 have minor informalities problems, Applicant's Representative counter-proposes to amend claims 1-3,5-9,15-17,20 to remove the problems raised by the Examiner and better clarify Applicant's invention, which the Examiner agreed. Accordingly, Applicant's Representative authorizes the Examiner to amend the claims as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment. As per claims 10-14, the Examiner also indicated that since Applicant did not point out the supposed errors in the Examiner's restriction requirement in the Office Action mailed on 10/19/2005, Applicant's election with traverse has been treated as an election without traverse, which Applicant's Representative agrees and also authorizes the Examiner to cancel claims 10-14 as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment. Additionally, Applicant's Representative also authorizes the Examiner to amend the abstract and the summary of invention portion of the specification as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment, to also reflect the changes in the independent claims 1 and 15, which better summarizes Applicant's invention as given in the specification (see especially Applicant's specification, page 12 as pointed out by Applicant's Representative), in which the common marked cell is used as the reference point from which the clock uncertainty is calculated.